

M. M. Chambers
Education Building, Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
47405

SINCE SEVENTH
1958 YEAR
Number 72 FEBRUARY 1965 Page 473

GRAPEVINE

A newsletter on state tax legislation; state appropriations for universities, colleges, and junior colleges; legislation affecting education at any level. There is no charge for GRAPEVINE, but recipients are asked to send timely newsnotes regarding pertinent events in their respective states.

IN THIS ISSUE

New York receives two important reports--

The 1964 revision of the "master plan" by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York..... 474

The Wells Report by Chancellor Herman B Wells of Indiana University and his committee of associates, John A. Perkins, G. Russell Clark, and Sidney G. Tickton..... 476

The nationwide cumulative annual summary table--

Appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education by the fifty states for six consecutive fiscal years, with total change over a 5-year period in dollar gains and percentage gains..... 479

Statement of ownership and circulation of GRAPEVINE is on Page 474 (reverse hereof).

NEW YORK. Limited to about 40 handsomely printed pages, the Master Plan Revision of 1964 for the State University Board of Trustees is dated November 20, 1964.

Thanks apparently to the influence of the new president, Samuel B. Gould, the report is a model of brevity and clarity, containing few dollar signs and no exhaustive or exhausting tabulations (in fact, only two small and simple ones of any kind).

The report is entitled Stature and Excellence: Focus for the Future, and central emphasis is on a worthy urge that New York, which has never had a state university, and now has a congeries of 58 institutions masquerading under that name, must somehow "fashion and operate a University noted for excellence among the public universities of the nation."

Criticized since its founding in 1948 for being "headless" without a great graduate school, SUNY now has three "University Centers" intended to become eventually top universities with distinguished graduate schools. The fourth, originally contemplated as a swift development of Harpur College at Binghamton, is as yet in embryonic stage.

One is at Albany, a present and future outgrowth and expansion of the former College for Teachers at Albany. Another is at Buffalo, by virtue of the acquisition of the private University of Buffalo in 1963. The third is at Stony Brook on Long Island, having been in operation only a short time and practically "starting from scratch".

The reference to the "public uni-

versities of the nation" is not original in the present report, having been borrowed from the 1959 report of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education (Grapevine, pages 153, 157-160). It is good to see this idea persist. Will New York succeed in developing three or four public institutions to the level of excellence attained by the University of California, the University of Michigan, and the other leading state universities of the midwest? It is a consummation devoutly to be wished.

In the 1950's SUNY, then without a medical college, acquired two private ones--at Brooklyn and Syracuse, and converted them into "Medical Centers" of its own. It acquired a third medical college with the take-over of the University of Buffalo. The Trustees now recommend that a fourth Medical Center be established as part of the University Center at Stony Brook, and that "studies be continued to determine the proper location for an additional medical center to be established during the 1970's."

The Trustees also recommend that a Marine Sciences Research Center be set up at Stony Brook, and that a Center for International Studies, apparently independent, be established at Planting Fields, Long Island, because of its proximity to the United Nations Headquarters in Manhattan and its accessibility to distinguished foreign visitors from all parts of the world.

For Albany, a new School of Social Welfare, a School of Criminal Justice, and rapid expansion and upgrading of the recently established Graduate School of Public Affairs are recommended.

GRAPEVINE is owned and circulated by M. M. Chambers. It is not a publication of any institution or association. Responsibility for any errors in the data, or for opinions expressed, is not to be attributed to any organization or person other than M. M. Chambers. GRAPEVINE is circulated chiefly to persons in position to reciprocate by furnishing prompt and accurate reports from their respective states regarding tax legislation, appropriations for higher education, and legislation affecting education at any level.

Address communications to M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, 47405

--- M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington ---

NEW YORK (Continued from Page 474)

A turning-of-the-road regarding the old alliance with Ivy League Cornell seems to be signalled in two recommendations: "That the specialized colleges, including contract colleges (of which four are at Cornell) not expand their programs of instruction and research into areas more properly assigned to the university centers" and "That the functions and programs of the contract colleges and the relationship of these colleges to the State University be re-examined." There are many possibilities here, ranging from the extreme of state acquisition of Cornell, lock, stock, and barrel, to the other extreme of totally disentangling the state colleges from Cornell, which has been entrusted with their local administration for many decades.

The feasibility of establishing a Graduate School of Library Science at one of the University Centers is to be explored. Generally, the University Centers are to develop doctoral programs "in the traditional arts and sciences. . . before doctoral work is developed in more specialized fields." (This may be a trifle officious!).

Under an impulse to elevate faculty quality, "the Trustees will establish at each of the University Centers an institute, consisting of four to six distinguished professors who will be provided with facilities and assistance to conduct research, create literary or artistic works, and offer instruction at the most advanced level. . . They will contribute substantially to the in-service development of the University's able young scholars. The example, encouragement, and criticism of the institute professors may be expected to stimulate and increase the scholarly productivity of their colleagues on every campus." Ultimately the development of a State University Press is contemplated, to help raise the status of SUNY in the world of learning and to provide a further unifying factor.

Quotable paragraph: It is common knowledge that research, together with the production of scholarly and artistic works, is the foundation upon which excellent instruction is built. Sustained efforts in this area, even when not pursued by all the faculty as a primary activity, prevent a university from becoming merely the passive guardian of a traditional body of knowledge. Research and allied efforts bring to a university intellectual criticism, competition, and change. From these, in turn, come curricular improvement and a keenness of scholarship which keep instruction fresh and vital."

The Trustees recommend that new four-year colleges of arts and sciences be established in Nassau and Westchester Counties, both in the New York City area; and that a program of studies beyond the Master's degree for the preparation of teachers for two-year colleges be established at one of the University Centers.

There are now 28 community colleges in operation, with their operating expenses paid one-third by the state, one-third by the local taxing subdivision (county), and one-third by student fees. Current law provides that one-half of capital outlays will be paid by the state.

There are also the six two-year Agricultural and Technical Colleges which are state institutions not based on local taxing districts. A budding intention of a few years ago to convert these into comprehensive community colleges does not seem to have bloomed. One recommendation now is "That, under normal circumstances, any new technical programs which would attract students from all areas of the state be established at one or more of the agricultural and technical colleges rather than at the community colleges."

The Trustees recommend expansion of community college facilities in Erie, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties,
(Continued on Page 476).

NEW YORK (Continued from Page 475) either by enlarging the existing institutions or by setting up outlying branches thereof; and suggests that, when study reveals the feasibility, new community colleges be established in Genessee County, Herkimer County, the Elmira-Horseheads region, and the Ithaca-Cortland regions.

Recognizing a situation where the facts of area and population make it appropriate to have the function of a two-year college performed by an existing four- or five-year college, the report recommends "That two-year programs in business and technical subjects be instituted at the State University College at Plattsburgh."

The full-time total enrollment of the total university is shown to have increased 119 per cent from 1959 to 1964, from 42,126 to 92,226. The increase at the two-year colleges was 153 per cent; in the four-year undergraduate programs it was 97 per cent; and among graduate students, 115 per cent. The total of graduate students in 1964 was only 5,073--only $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the total--and this ratio is just a trifle smaller than it was in 1959. Clearly emphasis needs to be placed on the development of graduate programs, but the report does not seem to point this out specifically.

For the total university, full-time enrollment goals of 160,500 in 1970 and 184,500 for 1974 are proposed. This means 100 per cent growth between 1964 and 1974, the ensuing decade. The estimate is probably too conservative.

The report shows throughout a considerable tendency toward flexibility and adaptability in the development of the various institutions and types of institutions, in contrast to the statutory rigidities of the current California scheme.

The report does not, however, mention the oft-repeated recommendation of recent studies (including the 1959 report of the Governor's Committee on Higher Education) that each institution

in the university complex be given a local lay board with responsibilities substantial enough to attract the service of leading citizens.

Concentrating on the academic matters, the report recommends "That the Faculty Senate be strengthened and additional machinery be devised to encourage more faculty participation in the formulation of academic policy."

Further, "That scholarly research (italics mine) and literary and artistic endeavors be strongly encouraged and supported throughout the University" and "That the in-service education of faculty members be strengthened through additional study and research grants. . . ." and "That intercampus conferences and other communications among faculty members of an academic discipline be given greater prominence."

All these point toward the raising of the University's level of maturity.

The Herman B Wells Report

In the summer of 1963 the leaders of the two houses of the New York legislature employed Chancellor Herman B Wells of Indiana University as Consultant to review the entire program of higher education in New York.

Associated with Chancellor Wells were President John A. Perkins of the University of Delaware and Chairman G. Russell Clark of the Commercial Bank of North America. Sidney G. Tickton was employed as study director.

The 65-page Wells Report was released to the press December 30, 1964. At many points it stresses substantially the same recommendations as the 1964 "master plan" of the Trustees of the State University of New York, though from different approaches and in different words. There is little or no conflict between the two reports, but the Wells Report deals with several matters of great importance that were not touched at all in the report of the Trustees.

Foremost among these is the autonomy of the University. A principal

----- M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington -----

NEW YORK (Continued from Page 476)
recommendation of the Wells Committee is that the state should:

"Give the State University substantially increased powers of self-determination, easing even further the remaining restrictions on administrative flexibility and permitting its board and central staff to function as an over-all policy-making, planning and coordinating agency for the university's far-flung network of institutions. The board and the staff can perform this essential function effectively only if they give up responsibility for the day-to-day operation of component units and are, in turn, freed from jurisdictional and policy conflicts with the Board of Regents, the state executive departments, and the Governor's office."

Dovetailing perfectly with the foregoing recommendation is another:

"Authorize the university's board of trustees to establish local boards of overseers for each unit of the State University to replace the existing advisory boards. These boards should be responsible for local operation and management."

And yet another:

"Improve the relationship between the State University Construction Fund and the State University. Surely a better system can be devised than the present one, which splits the responsibility for State University construction between two state-supported organizations, both located in Albany, and depends for its effectiveness and economical operation on the dedication of the officials of both organizations."

(It will be remembered that for many years the entanglement of university construction with the state Department of Public Works produced increasingly intolerable delays and needless irritations, finally reaching a point in 1961 where from 4 to 6 years

were elapsing between the time when a building was authorized and the time when it was ready for occupancy. Governor Rockefeller persuaded the 1962 legislature to detach this busy work from the Department of Public Works and create a State University Construction Fund to expedite it. He then appointed General David W. Traub, retired Controller of the U. S. Army, to head this agency, expecting to reduce the "lead time" to two or three years. /GRAPEVINE, Page 318/ The Wells Committee now finds that the results have not been optimal, and seems to be asking indirectly 'Why cannot the SUNY Board of Trustees be trusted to supervise and operate its own building program?').

Another important recommendation of the Wells Report:

"Grant the State University the option now available to the 'contract' colleges (at Cornell University and Alfred University) to make purchases through sources other than the New York State Division of Standards and Purchase."

Other recommendations point toward the desirability of a climate in which the Trustees will feel free to encourage variations in the programs of the different units of the university, and the creation of new programs to meet new needs; to select suitable locations for the concentration of instruction and research in rare advanced specialties; to work out forms of interinstitutional cooperation which may involve both private and public institutions; and "to enter into forms of joint partnership with industry and government to provide the advanced technical and semi-professional training and retraining already badly needed and likely to be needed increasingly in the future in the science and engineering fields, business, the health professions and the social welfare specialties."

(Continued on Page 478)

NEW YORK (Continued from Page 477)

These latter arrangements, the report indicates, will involve some ingenuity and inventiveness on both sides, and industry and government may well adopt more and more liberal policies and practices regarding leaves of absence for study, and payment of all or a substantial part of the travel, tuition, and other costs.

The report looks with some enthusiasm on the likelihood of developing a really top-ranking public university in the Buffalo area, partly by means of improving the organization and relationships of three units of the state university that are already located there: the State University Center at Buffalo (formerly the private University of Buffalo); the State University College at Buffalo (formerly the State College for Teachers at Buffalo); and the State University College at Fredonia, about 45 miles distant. Considering the huge concentration of population in the city of Buffalo and Erie County, the evolution of a great public university is promising.

In harmony with its mandate to "review the entire program of higher education in the state," the Wells Committee gave somewhat more attention to private institutions than did the report of the SUNY Trustees; and also made longer, though necessarily more approximate, projections into the future.

Setting a distant benchmark at 1985, the report says today's total of 290,000 students in private institutions

will increase to 500,000. Today's total of 260,000 in public institutions (including both the State University and the City University of New York) will increase to one million. This apparently means that within twenty years two-thirds of all students will be in the public institutions, reversing the balance which has hitherto prevailed in New York State. Public expenditures for higher education will grow enormously, being tripled by 1975, within ten years from now.

Chancellor Wells and his associates did not fail to notice that the Board of Higher Education of the City of New York, governing the City University of New York, has been and is subjected to much the same administrative controls and fiscal rigidities as those that have burdened the State University. "We believe the degree of control by nonuniversity officials over university operations is so great as to reduce the potential educational effectiveness of many of the City University's most capable personnel."

The near-simultaneous production of the Wells Report and the 1964 revision of the "master plan" by the Trustees of the State University of New York seems to have been a fortunate conjunction of events. The two reports complement each other and reinforce each other, but they are by no means alike. Their approaches are different and the ground covered is not the same. Either one deals with some matters not touched by the other. Together, they provide a superb traverse of higher education in New York at the beginning of 1965.

Not copyrighted. If you quote or paraphrase, please credit the source in appropriate manner.

M. M. Chambers, Education Building, Indiana University, Bloomington

FIVE-YEAR PERIOD, 1959-1964, SHOWS WEIGHTED AVERAGE
GAIN OF 75 PER CENT IN APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE
TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION

On the reverse of this sheet, on Page 480, GRAPEVINE offers a tabulation of the fifty states showing for each the approximate percentage of gain over a period of five years in the sums appropriated out of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education.

The materials on Pages 478 and 479 have designedly been placed back-to-back, so they can never appear separately (except when the mimeograph machine slips a blank). A tabulation as large as Table 7 on Page 479 cannot be understood without some explanation of what the figures represent, and some warning as to what types of misinterpretations are most likely to occur.

The figures in Table 7 are intended to show (in Columns 2-7) only appropriations of state tax funds for operating expenses of higher education. This excludes institutional income from any and all sources other than state tax funds. For example, in some states where student fees or income from other non-state-tax sources are transferred to the state treasury and held there until appropriated by the legislature, such appropriations are not of state tax funds, and are excluded from Table 7.

The figures represent appropriations made usually before the beginning of the fiscal year or biennium; but in some instances where these sums have later been changed materially by subsequent supplemental appropriations, or by administrative reduction of quarterly allotments on account of decrease in anticipated tax revenues, as can occur in some states, the figures have been adjusted accordingly.

Being a representation of sums appropriated, Table 7 is not a report of total expenditures after the fact, such as is reported by the United States Bureau of the Census in its publication entitled State Government Finances. That report includes expenditures of funds from numerous sources other than state taxes, and in some instances shows totals twice

as large as those in our Table 7.

A further step sometimes taken is that of dividing the total expenditures by the total population of the state, thus getting a quotient which is taken to represent the per capita cost of higher education to all citizens of the state.

These quotients are in some instances twice as large as the quotients that can be obtained by dividing the figures in Columns 2-7 of our Table 7 by the total populations of the respective states. This is because the latter quotients would represent the average per capita state tax cost of higher education to each citizen of the state. Few if any public colleges, universities, or junior colleges are wholly tax-supported, and several of the larger state universities are currently getting substantially less than half of their operating income from state tax sources.

"Higher education" as used in Table 7 includes all formal education above the high school, if supported in part by state tax funds. Thus Table 7 includes sums appropriated as state aid for operating expenses of local public community-junior colleges, in some 24 states where that is currently the practice. In earlier GRAPEVINE tabulations, this item was excluded and tabulated separately.

Table 7 includes state aid for operating expenses of municipal universities in a few states where this is practiced, and also includes sums appropriated for scholarships tenable in either private or public institutions where these occur. These two items are especially large in the state of New York.

Appropriations of state tax funds directly to private institutions for operating expenses are also included. This occurs on a substantial scale in only one state--Pennsylvania, and on a negligible scale in a few other states.

GRAPEVINE is always receptive to corrections in the tabulation.

Table 7. APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR SIX CONSECUTIVE FISCAL YEARS (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS), WITH TOTAL CHANGE OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD SHOWN IN DOLLAR GAINS AND PERCENTAGE GAINS

States	Year 1959-60	Year 1960-61	Year 1961-62	Year 1962-63	Year 1963-64	Year 1964-65	5-Year Gain	Per Cent Gain
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Ala	21,823	22,397	20,535	22,659	29,133	30,421	8,598	39%
Alaska	2,111	2,323	3,023	3,301	4,817	5,300	3,189	151%
Ariz	14,042	16,218	18,305	21,007	25,683	29,742	15,700	112%
Ark	13,551	13,551	16,599	16,599	20,369	20,369	6,818	50%
Cal	188,604	221,592	247,172	277,708	301,304	351,982	163,378	87%
Colo	17,271	24,332	27,149	31,255	35,279	35,837	18,566	107%
Conn	12,273	13,080	14,855	15,948	18,585	19,706	7,433	61%
Del	3,731	3,734	4,368	5,094	5,831	6,493	2,762	74%
Fla	40,392	41,412	51,438	53,452	68,143	75,695	35,303	87%
Ga	24,058	26,605	29,046	32,162	35,270	41,770	17,712	74%
Hawaii	4,958	5,825	7,254	8,515	10,867	12,580	7,622	154%
Ida	8,799	8,800	10,137	10,137	11,203	11,203	2,404	27%
Ill	90,289	90,290	116,293	116,293	148,170	148,170	57,881	64%
Ind	45,463	50,163	55,316	62,709	70,866	80,134	34,671	76%
Iowa	34,630	34,861	39,682	39,705	48,275	48,328	13,698	40%
Kas	25,036	27,938	30,172	35,423	38,390	44,583	19,547	78%
Ky	14,954	19,672	24,491	29,573	32,164	42,783	27,828	186%
La	40,062	44,557	48,316	46,760	55,847	65,031	24,969	62%
Me	3,356	5,599	7,238	7,429	9,099	9,709	6,353	189%
Md	23,818	25,166	27,208	30,678	34,812	39,177	15,359	64%
Mass	12,167	13,361	15,281	16,503	19,874	28,415	16,248	134%
Mich	95,599	101,836	102,816	109,759	115,604	138,063	42,464	44%
Minn	36,173	38,920	43,908	45,117	49,710	55,059	18,886	49%
Miss	15,118	18,347	18,347	19,863	19,873	25,931	10,813	72%
Mo	24,744	25,641	29,251	33,603	44,526	46,847	22,103	89%
Mont	11,230	11,231	10,660	10,661	12,177	13,367	2,137	19%
Nebr	15,217	15,218	17,077	17,078	18,820	18,820	3,603	24%
Nev	3,682	4,107	4,863	5,325	6,042	6,518	2,836	77%
N H	3,973	4,106	4,717	4,733	5,146	5,104	1,131	28%
N J	21,982	24,457	28,421	34,179	40,020	45,816	23,834	108%
N M	11,165	11,239	13,002	14,372	15,960	18,636	7,471	67%
N Y	78,546	94,115	116,879	163,656	182,918	228,614	150,068	191%
N C	28,419	30,574	36,087	36,815	46,768	51,431	23,012	81%
N D	9,368	9,368	10,505	10,505	12,079	12,109	2,741	29%
Ohio	43,331	45,326	52,014	55,620	60,670	67,670	24,339	56%
Okla	27,014	27,020	30,014	30,020	33,505	33,505	6,491	24%
Ore	28,719	28,719	34,796	34,263	39,923	39,998	11,279	39%
Pa	43,471	43,472	46,431	56,187	66,064	68,819	25,348	58%
R I	4,477	5,271	5,826	7,697	7,963	10,283	5,806	130%
S C	12,113	13,141	14,449	15,440	17,360	19,286	7,173	59%
S D	8,078	8,128	8,675	8,702	10,133	12,338	4,260	53%
Tenn	17,022	17,023	21,522	22,359	28,324	31,892	14,870	87%
Texas	71,021	72,133	84,873	90,282	114,924	114,156	43,135	61%
Utah	13,139	13,139	15,580	15,580	19,154	19,154	6,015	46%
Vt	3,264	3,399	3,759	3,750	4,986	5,445	2,181	67%
Va	19,943	23,187	23,983	34,625	35,858	39,527	19,584	98%
Wash	46,909	47,441	58,733	58,387	69,913	71,973	25,064	53%
W Va	18,569	20,337	23,519	24,437	26,176	27,761	9,192	50%
Wis	34,834	37,417	40,895	44,670	51,490	60,410	25,576	73%
Wyo	4,935	4,935	5,916	5,916	6,707	6,707	1,772	36%
Totals	1,393,443	1,510,723	1,721,396	1,896,511	2,186,774	2,442,666	1,049,223	75.3%